DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 633 CG 010 973

AUTHOR Grites, Thomas J.
TITLE The 4 x 4 Model for Student Development.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 6p.; Paper presented at Annual Convention of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (Chicago, Illinois, April 11-14, 1976); For related documents, see CG 010 970-973 and CG 011 053

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; Counseling Programs; *Counselor Functions; Counselor Role; Developmental Guidance; *Educational Counseling; Higher Education; *Models; Program Descriptions; Speeches; *Student Development; *Student Personnel Services

ABSTRACT

Four operational functions in counseling are described: (1) primary function of academic advising, (2) the professional advising role, (3) personal counseling, and (4) the programmatic dimension of the 4 x 4 model, which comprises preview, planning, process and postview or follow-up. Guidelines for use of the model are described. (KS)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED133633

The 4 x 4 Model for Student Development — Dr. Thomas J. Grites

Now that you have an idea about what we are trying to do at the University of Maryland, I'd like to present you with a model that I think we would like to work toward, and one that you can take back to your own institutions for review and possible adaptation. On the last page of your handout, you will find a pictorial presentation of the model I am suggesting.

The 4 x 4 model presented here is an attempt to combine and expand into one viable system, the ACPA developmental model and O'Banion's academic advising model, which you may review in the 1972 Junior College Journal. A unique characteristic of the 4 x 4 model is that it is administered through the academic structure of the institution, so please keep that in mind. The operational functions, as indicated on your handout, are described as follows:

First, the Primary function of academic advising: this is typically described in terms of what courses fulfill certain requirements, who is the best teacher for a course, and how, when, and where to change schedules. These are considered the primary advising responsibilities and seem relatively consistent for all students. This routine function has been performed by various personnel, including advising specialists, faculty members, professional counselors, and trained paraprofessionals. The preference in this model is toward a centralized staff of advising specialists supported by trained paraprofessionals. In this way, those who are both interested in, and trained for the details involved in the course choice and scheduling aspects of academic advising, are actually performing these functions.

Second, the Professional advising role: faculty members reserve the authority to advise in the professional areas of graduate school expectation and requirements, selection of graduate and professional schools and career development, expecially for alternative careers, within their own disciplines. Personnel other than faculty, cannot be omniscient about all related curricular matters on campus, especially in the midst

ED010973



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

of modern liberalized curricula. This model suggests the use of selected faculty members as "professional" advisors. Only those faculty members who are committed to an effective student development program should be utilized; the special talents of other faculty would be better utilized elsewhere within the academic department.

Next, the Personal counseling aspect of advising: the role of psychological counselor must remain with counseling center personnel. Again, counselors are both more interested in, and better trained for this particular aspect of the academic advisement process. However, personal, social, and emotional adjustment problems may affect or result from academic matters; therefore, academic advisors should possess certain recognition and referral skills that will facilitate the student's total psychological adjustment.

And finally, the Programmatic dimension of the 4 x 4 model, which I feel has been heretofore untapped as a source of enrichment experiences for students. Attempts to include faculty members beyond the primary and professional advising roles are very sparse. There is no reason why co-curricular efforts between residence hall staffs, international and minority student advisors, admissions counselsors, student activities programmers, and faculty advisors should not be attempted. Remember, now that these attempts are now originating from the academic unit, not directed toward it, as has been typical in the past. Such interaction is essential in a successful student development program. Again, it is the academic advisor - peer, faculty, or specialist - who can suggest, plan, and participate in programs that enhance the student's educational goals and interests.

Turning now to the horizontal axis of your handout, we must think of student development as transcending a student's earliest contact with the institution and perpetuating itself through an indefinite period of time. The development stages of this model are described as follows:

In the Preview stage, admissions personnel do an admirable recruiting job in presenting admission criteria, financial aid and housing information, available curricula, and a general description of the institution. However, those who are most closely associated with curricular programs should be available, when and where possible, to describe them. After all, it is in the academic/curricular sense that the student's primary contract with the institution exists. Advisors (faculty, staff, or students) might attend "College Nights," "Career Days," or special interest club meetings in the area secondary schools; also pre-advising programs may be established with nearby community colleges. The prospective student then meets someone with whom he/she is likely to meet again, and a more meaningful relationship and communication is likely to occur.

Next, the Planning stage: Orientation Programs, like ours that Denny directs, have served well as the initial steps in both academic advising and student development. Many institutions further require "Freshman Seminar" courses that elaborate upon Summer Orientation Programs. Beyond these initial programs, however, the responsibility for further educational planning must be assumed elsewhere in the institution. Since academic advising occurs, in some form, each term for each student, it is the most appropriate mechanism through which educational activities can be planned. These activities, whether directly related or ancillary to instruction, must be initiated through the various functions of academic advising previously described, especially the programmatic function.

Now comes a very important stage - Process. Unless the student actually performs the planned functions and activities, the program has had little significance. The processes by which this program is fulfilled are those I mentioned in the programmatic function of advising, and formal instruction. The academic advisor (faculty member, advising specialist, counselor or paraprofessional) is responsible for monitoring the student's progress toward planned educational goals, whether that process occurs through advising or instruction. Periodic reviews of the student's progress

toward fulfilling degree requirements, toward academic excellence, and performance and participation in supplemental learning activities must be made. It should be noted that the Planning and Process stages occur continuously and simultaneously while the student is on the campus.

And the final step-a Postview: Alumni offices and placement centers usually initiate follow-up contacts with those students who graduated, but there are two basic deficiencies in these typical contacts. First of all, they are too often limited in their purposes, i.e., to request money, to boast about certain characteristics of the graduates, to recruit graduate students, or to invite them to a picnic. Such contacts should also be used for evaluation and information purposes both of the student development and curricular programs. With these data, the total educational program can be assessed for its effects on students. Such information can further make the graduate feel a sense of contribution while he/she attended, and this sense of belonging can help recycle the developmental process, i.e., as a recruiting function for the "Preview" stage. The second observable deficiency is that follow-up contacts rarely include those students who indicated an interest, but never attended the institution, and those who left it through withdrawal, transfer, or dismissal. An extensive study of these students might suggest necessary programmatic, administrative or fiscal changes that would strengthen the total educational program.

There are several features of the 4 x 4 model that should be emphasized.

First, the model can be adapted to the individualities of institutions and institutional organizations. It is organizationally stable, since it is administered through the academic unit(s) of the institution. These units constitute the core of the institution and are relatively secure in their structure; whereas student personnel divisions seem to undergo structural revisions much more frequently.

Second, having a student development program administered through the academic structure is a significant feature in itself. Perhaps the historical division

between student personnel administrators and academicians will be lessened. In fact, a reversal might occur, i.e., academicians might seek out the expertise of student development specialists for the establishment and implementation of educational programs.

Third, the model suggests the most efficient and economic use of all available institutional resources. Faculty, staff, students, and administrators each contribute their own unique interest and expertise to the program.

And finally, there are various ways in which the model can be evaluated. Once baseline data are established, many objective criteria may be used for evaluation. Some of these criteria might be the number of advisement errors reported by students, the numbers of appropriate referrals made to the counseling center and other campus agencies, the number of scheduled advising appointments, the numbers of informal faculty-student contacts, as well as enrollment figures, retention figures, student participation in co-curricular programs, non-advisement activities of faculty, and job placement data. More qualitative evaluations might occur in the form of specifically designed survey instruments which are completed by current students, graduates, advisors, academic and student personnel administrators, and non-participating faculty members.

It seems to me then, this is a viable model adaptable to most institutions, and I encourage your responses and reactions to it, as well as other parts of our program. Thank you.